



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/629,219	07/31/2000	Lior Shabtay	3-7	3977

7590 03/07/2007
JOSEPH B. RYAN
RYAN, MASON & LEWIS, LLP
90 FOREST AVENUE
LOCUST VALLEY, NY 11560

EXAMINER

MILLS, DONALD L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2616

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/07/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/629,219

Applicant(s)

SHABTAY ET AL.

Examiner

Donald L. Mills

Art Unit

2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 October 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17,26-43 and 45-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17,26-43 and 45-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 16 October 2006, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A new grounds of rejection is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, Applicant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then Applicant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Art Unit: 2616

Regarding claims 1-13, the claims merely recite a data structure, for example, a layer-3 multicasting routing table (See claim 1.) The data structure is a mere arrangement of data, independent of physical data. The data structure does not represent a process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter. The claim merely manipulates an abstract idea without producing a “useful, concrete and tangible result;” therefore, claims 1-13 are directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 26, 28, 31-34, 38, 39, and 41-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gleeson et al. (US 5,959,989), hereinafter referred to as Gleeson.

Regarding claims 26 and 28, Gleeson discloses a method for efficiently distributing multicast messages having group destination address to subscribing entities in a computer network, which comprises:

A plurality of ports (Referring to Figure 2A, switch 221 comprises ports 1-5.)

A layer-2 bridging unit which bridges packets between the ports responsive to their destination MAC address and their VLAN (Referring to Figures 2A and 6, switch 221 bridges

Art Unit: 2616

packets between ports based upon their destination MAC address and their VLAN identifier.

See column 18, lines 53-64.)

A multicast detector which identifies a group of at least some of the IP multicast routing related packets received by the switch, the group including IGMP queries, and prevents the layer-2 bridging unit from bridging the identified packets at least through ports which do not lead to at least one neighboring layer-3 switch or router (Referring to Figure 2A and 6, switch 221 which bridges packets between ports based upon their destination MAC address and their VLAN identifier, utilizing the MAC address which corresponds to layer-2 switching (See column 18, lines 53-64.) The intermediate device, switch 221, monitors and forwards multicast messages (multicast detector) to the corresponding MND 226 (See column 10, lines 44-47.) The switch 221 forwards packets at the data link level (layer-2 bridging) on the LAN (See column 12, lines 36-38.) Switch 221 detects multicast packets, including IGMP queries, and forwards them to corresponding MND 226 and not to ports that are not connected to MND 226, such as, ports 1, 4, and 5 (See column 9, lines 46-50.) Therefore, switch 221 prevents IGMP queries from transmission through ports 1, 4, and 5, which do not lead to a neighboring router.)

Regarding claim 31, Gleeson et al. discloses supporting DVMRP, PIM-SM, and PIM-DM. See col. 9, lines 23-26. With multiple protocols, it is inherent that the switch is response to these protocols.

Regarding claims 32 and 33, Gleeson et al. discloses distributing multicast messages that include control and routing related packets. The group of packets identified also configured for all its VLANs. See col. 9, lines 18-19.

Art Unit: 2616

Regarding claim 34, Gleeson et al. discloses the MND, which uses the multicast controller 306. It also routes at least IP related packets between ports of the same VLAN.

Regarding claim 38, Gleeson discloses a method for efficiently distributing multicast messages having group destination address to subscribing entities in a computer network, which comprises:

At least one VLAN interface which does not have an associated IP router interface

A layer-3 output unit which directs IP packets with a MAC source address of the switch through the at least one VLAN interface

Wherein the layer-3 output unit directs packets through the at least one VLAN interface, with an IP source address associated with a different VLAN interface of the switch (Referring to Figure 2A, the MND 226 is a type of layer-3 switch (router) that directs packets to the R, G, and B VLAN interfaces (See column 7, lines 57-59.) The MND 226 does not have an associated IP router interface. The distribution of messages also uses the MAC address derived from the IP destination address. The router (layer-3 output unit) forwards multicast IP packets with a source address corresponding to another host (IP source address associated with a different VLAN interface of the switch) through port 1 (VLAN interface) to host 33 (See col. 12, lines 36-44.)

Regarding claim 39, as mentioned previously, the MND 226 is capable of handling IP packets routed in layer-3.

Regarding claims 41 and 42, Gleeson discloses that packets like DVMRP, PIM-SM, and PIM-DM can be sent (packets of a routing protocol). See col. 9, lines 23-26.

Regarding claim 43, Gleeson discloses that leave and join packets can be sent (IP multicast control packets). See col. 9, line 65.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-17, 27, 29, 30, 35-37, 40, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gleeson et al. (US 5,959,989), hereinafter referred to as Gleeson, in view of Varghese et al. (US 5,963,556), hereinafter referred to as Varghese.

Regarding claims 1, 2, and 48, Gleeson discloses a method for efficiently distributing multicast messages having group destination address to subscribing entities in a computer network, which comprises:

Dividing the LAN to a number of segments larger than the number of virtual LANs (VLANs) in the network (Referring to Figure 2A, computer network 200, which includes a plurality of local area networks 204-214. See column 7, lines 50-59. The Examiner interprets each of these LANs as having a “segment” connecting each router or switch to a terminal. The intermediate devices 220-223 are capable of establishing segmented virtual local area networks (VLANs) by associating various groups of LANs 204-214. See column 8, lines 4-8. Based upon the Examiner’s interpretation, if the segments make up the VLANs, then there must be more segments than VLANs.)

Gleeson does not expressly disclose *creating a layer-3 multicasting routing table, which relates to each of the segments separately.*

Art Unit: 2616

Vargese teaches a device for partition ports of a bridge into groups of different virtual local area networks in which a router maintains a layer-3 multicasting table, which relates to each bridge port (each segment separately) (Referring to Figure 4, see column 8, lines 1-2 and 15-17.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the multicasting table of bridge ports of Vargese in the routing devices of Gleeson. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to only transmits on bridge ports to hosts that are members of the corresponding multicast groups, thereby, reducing traffic flow and bandwidth as taught by Gleeson (See column 5, lines 27-40.) An added benefit of doing so would result in reduced network congestion and costs due to decreased network traffic.

Further regarding claim 48, Vargese teaches two methods of operation, one in which both the VLAN and port are identified (See column 8, lines 15-19) and one in which the source addresses for each VLAN is utilized (See column 7, lines 35-36.)

Regarding claim 2 more specifically, the purpose of the table in Vargese is so that the packets, which match the entries in the table according to their port, will be routed to the correct destination.

Regarding claim 3, the primary reference further teaches that the VLAN designation table associates each port of the device with the VLAN designation. See col. 8, lines 19-23.

Regarding claim 4, the primary reference further teaches identifying subscribing VLAN ports in the forwarding table 250. The group forwarding table preferably associates each group

Art Unit: 2616

multicast address with the VLAN designations of the subscribing entities and the port numbers used to reach those entities (legal interface). See col. 10, lines 22-34.

Regarding claim 5, the primary reference further teaches, as shown in Fig. 2A, some of the LAN segments are different physical places from the other LAN segments. For example, LAN 204 and LAN 212 are not in the same physical location.

Regarding claim 6, the primary reference further teaches dividing VLAN Orange (O) of the LAN into a plurality of segments on LANs and trunk lines 207, 230, 232, 234, and 210 in Fig. 2A.

Regarding claim 7, the primary reference further teaches, as shown in Fig. 2A, the different LAN segments with 2 or more hosts connected are all connected on different segments.

Regarding claim 8, the primary reference further teaches that a backbone segment such as 230 in Fig. 2A that includes all the links for each VLAN that connects switches 220 and 221. Gleeson et al. discloses that external ports are used on 230 implies this backbone segment.

Regarding claim 9, the primary reference further teaches that each VLAN can be divided such that non backbone segments connect one or more hosts to each layer-3 switch, such as 208 in Fig. 2A that connects 3 hosts in the Green VLAN to layer-3 switch 221.

Regarding claim 10, the primary reference further teaches making the determination whether to distribute messages in that particular VLAN segment. See col. 11, lines 27-42.

Regarding claim 11, the primary reference further teaches that the multicast management conforms to IGMP. See col. 8, line 63.

Regarding claims 12 and 13, the primary reference further teaches the layer-3 switches, the MNDs 226 and 228, will not perform layer-2 switching, which is done by intermediate devices 220-223. See col. 7, lines 50-59.

Regarding claim 14, Gleeson discloses a method for efficiently distributing multicast messages having group destination address to subscribing entities in a computer network, which comprises:

Receiving a multicast packet by the switch through a first physical port on a first VLAN (Referring to Figure 2A, multicast network device (routers) receive a multicast packet through port 2 for a given VLAN. See column 8, lines 55-57.)

Wherein the multicast packet is bridged in layer-2 through a second physical port of the layer-3 switch (Referring to Figure 2A, the multicast packet is bridged in layer-2 via switch 221 through port 1 of the layer-3 router 226.)

Gleeson does not disclose *routing the multicast packet in layer-3 out a physical port of the switch, on the first VLAN.*

Vargese teaches a device for partition ports of a bridge into groups of different virtual local area networks in which a router maintains a layer-3 multicasting table which relates to each bridge port for routing the multicast packet in layer-3 out of a physical port of the router on a first or subsequent VLAN (Referring to Figure 4, see column 8, lines 1-2 and 15-17.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the multicasting table of bridge ports of Vargese in the routing devices of Gleeson. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to only transmits on bridge ports to hosts that are members of the corresponding multicast groups, thereby, reducing

Art Unit: 2616

traffic flow and bandwidth as taught by Gleeson (See column 5, lines 27-40.) An added benefit of doing so would result in reduced network congestion and costs due to decreased network traffic.

Regarding claim 15, the primary reference further teaches discloses decrementing the TTL. See col. 13, line 52.

Regarding claim 16, the primary reference further teaches as shown in Fig. 2A, port 1 on RMD 226 leads to a layer-3 router.

Regarding claim 17, the primary reference further teaches as shown in Fig. 2A, the connection between port 2 and the host is not bridged.

Regarding claim 27, it is well known that a bridge can act as a filter and not select certain packets to pass. It would have been obvious to include this feature into modified Gleeson et al. system. One would have been motivated to do this because certain packets should not be transmitted in order to save on bandwidth.

Regarding claims 29 and 30, the modified version of the switch in Gleeson et al. would include the ability to bridge the identified packets through a plurality of ports in the subset of ports.

Regarding claims 35, 36, and 37, the modified version of Gleeson et al. discloses that the bridging capabilities will prevent certain packets from being forwarded, irrespective of their destination addresses.

Regarding claim 40, Gleeson et al. does not expressly disclose generating IP packets at a higher layer in the switch; however, it is well known that higher levels than level-3 can generate IP packets. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

Art Unit: 2616

invention to include packets generated at higher levels in the system disclosed by Gleeson et al. One would have been motivated to do this because this would simplify some of the routing processes that otherwise would have to take place.

8. Claims 45-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gleeson et al. (US 5,959,989), hereinafter referred to as Gleeson.

Regarding claims 45, Gleeson discloses a method for efficiently distributing multicast messages having group destination address to subscribing entities in a computer network, which comprises:

Receiving a packet with a source MAC address and a TTL value (Referring to Figure 6, receiving frame 402a at a switch and converting to frame 610. See column 12, line 40 and column 13, line 52.)

Changing the source MAC address of the received packet (Referring to Figures 3, controller 306 deletes the MAC header comprising the MAC source address field, thereby changing the MAC address value to the null value. See column 13, lines 23-26.)

Gleeson does not disclose *forwarding the packet with the changed MAC address but with the same TTL value.*

Gleeson teaches the switch utilizes conventional routing functions, such as, decrementing the TTL value indicating that the switch may decrement the TTL value (See column 13, lines 52-62.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time was made to implement packet forwarding with same TTL value in the system of Gleeson. One of ordinary

Art Unit: 2616

skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to implement a router with a greater effective hop count limit to increase the effective propagation range of a datagram for communication with distant devices as consistent with conventional routing functions as taught by Gleeson.

Regarding claim 46, the primary reference further teaches receiving a packet 402a at switch 220 of Fig. 2A comprising an IP multicast packet generated by Red VLAN entity 27. See also Fig. 4A, and col. 12, lines 21-32.

Regarding claim 47, the primary reference further teaches forwarding the packet received from Red VLAN entity 27 with the Red VLAN onto ports 3 and 5 of switch 220 in Fig. 2A. See col. 12, lines 45-65.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

10. Applicant's arguments filed 16 October 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

On page 5 of the brief, regarding claims 26, 28, and 31-34, the Applicant argues Gleeson does not disclose *a layer-2 bridging unit which bridges packets between the ports responsive to their destination MAC address and their VLAN; a multicast detector which identifies a group of at least some of the IP multicast routing related packets received by the switch, the group including IGMP queries, and prevents the layer-2 bridging unit from bridging the identified*

Art Unit: 2616

packets at least through ports which do not lead to at least one neighboring layer-3 switch or router. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Gleeson discloses, referring to Figures 2A and 6, switch 221 which bridges packets between ports based upon their destination MAC address and their VLAN identifier, utilizing the MAC address which corresponds to layer-2 switching (See column 18, lines 53-64.) The intermediate device, switch 221, monitors and forwards multicast messages (multicast detector) to the corresponding MND 226 (See column 10, lines 44-47.) The switch 221 forwards packets at the data link level (layer-2 bridging) on the LAN (See column 12, lines 36-38.) Gleeson discloses, referring to Figure 2A, switch 221 detects multicast packets, including IGMP queries, and forwards them to corresponding MND 226 and not to ports that are not connected to MND 226, such as, ports 1, 4, and 5 (See column 9, lines 46-50.) Therefore, switch 221 prevents IGMP queries from transmission through ports 1, 4, and 5, which do not lead to a neighboring router. Therefore, Gleeson discloses *a layer-2 bridging unit which bridges packets between the ports responsive to their destination MAC address and their VLAN; a multicast detector which identifies a group of at least some of the IP multicast routing related packets received by the switch, the group including IGMP queries, and prevents the layer-2 bridging unit from bridging the identified packets at least through ports which do not lead to at least one neighboring layer-3 switch or router.*

On page 6 of the brief, regarding claims 38, 39, and 41-43, the Applicant argues Gleeson does not disclose *wherein the layer-3 output unit directs packets through the at least one VLAN interface, with an IP source address associated with a different VLAN interface of the switch.* The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Gleeson discloses, referring to Figure 2A, the MND 226 is a type of layer-3 switch (router) that directs packets to the R, G, and B VLAN interfaces (See

Art Unit: 2616

column 7, lines 57-59.) The MND 226 does not have an associated IP router interface. The distribution of messages also uses the MAC address derived from the IP destination address. The router (layer-3 output unit) forwards multicast IP packets with a source address corresponding to another host (IP source address associated with a different VLAN interface of the switch) through port 1 (VLAN interface) to host 33 (See col. 12, lines 36-44.) Therefore, Gleeson discloses *wherein the layer-3 output unit directs packets through the at least one VLAN interface, with an IP source address associated with a different VLAN interface of the switch.*

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

On page 7 of the brief, regarding claims 1-5 and 10-13, the Applicant argues that neither Gleeson nor Varghese disclose, teach, or otherwise make obvious *creating a layer-3 multicast routing table, which relates to each of the segments separately.* The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Examiner politely reminds the Applicant that a claim is read in its broadest reasonable literal interpretation. In addition, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims, instead the claims are read in light of the specification. With this understanding in mind and the broad nature of the claim limitation the Examiner interprets a segment as the link between the station and bridge. Vargese teaches a device for partition ports of a bridge into groups of different virtual local area networks in which a router maintains a layer-3 multicasting table, which relates to each bridge port (each segment separately) (Referring to Figure 4, see column 8, lines 1-2 and 15-17.) Therefore, Vargese teaches *creating a layer-3 multicast routing table, which relates to each of the segments separately* and does not teach away from the claimed invention as stated by the Applicant.

Art Unit: 2616

In response to Applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the Examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement the multicasting table of bridge ports of Vargese in the routing devices of Gleeson. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to only transmits on bridge ports to hosts that are members of the corresponding multicast groups, thereby, reducing traffic flow and bandwidth as taught by Gleeson (See column 5, lines 27-40.) An added benefit of doing so would result in reduced network congestion and costs due to decreased network traffic.

In response to Applicant's argument that the Examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the Applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

On pages 9 and 10 of the brief, regarding claims 6-9, the Applicant argues that neither Gleeson nor Varghese disclose, teach, or otherwise make obvious *creating a layer-3 multicast*

Art Unit: 2616

routing table, which relates to each of the segments separately. The Examiner disagrees for the same reasons stated above.

On page 10 of the brief, regarding claims 14-17, the Applicant argues that neither Gleeson nor Varghese disclose, teach, or otherwise make obvious *wherein the multicast packet is bridged in layer-2 through a second physical port of the layer-3 switch.* The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Again, Examiner politely reminds the Applicant that a claim is read in its broadest reasonable literal interpretation. In addition, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims, instead the claims are read in light of the specification. Utilizing a literal interpretation of the claim, Gleeson discloses bridging multicast packet in layer-2 via switch 221 through port 1 of the layer-3 router 226 (Referring to Figure 2A, see column 12, lines 36-38 and column 18, lines 53-64.) Therefore, Gleeson discloses *wherein the multicast packet is bridged in layer-2 through a second physical port of the layer-3 switch.*

On page 11 of the brief, regarding claims 27, 29, and 30, the Applicant argues the claims are allowable for reasons identified with respect to claim 26. The Examiner respectfully disagrees for the same reasons stated above.

On pages 11 and 12 of the brief, regarding claims 35-37, the Applicant argues that neither Gleeson nor Varghese disclose, teach, or otherwise make obvious *a multicast detector prevents the layer-2 bridging of packets, irrespective of the IP destination address of the packets.* The Examiner respectfully disagrees for the same reasons stated above. Furthermore, the modified version of Gleeson teaches that the bridging capabilities will prevent certain packets from being forwarded, because Gleeson's switch will not forward multi-cast packets to unintended VLAN IDs regardless of their IP destination address (See column 10, lines 22-33 and column 13, lines

Art Unit: 2616

6-18.) Therefore, Gleeson teaches *a multicast detector which prevents the layer-2 bridging of packets, irrespective of the IP destination address of the packets.*

On page 12 of the brief, regarding claim 40, the Applicant argues the claims are allowable for reasons identified with respect to claim 36. The Examiner respectfully disagrees for the same reasons stated above.

On page 12 of the brief, regarding claim 48, the Applicant argues neither Gleeson nor Varghese disclose, teach, or otherwise make obvious *wherein the layer-3 multicast routing table may operate in a first mode in which interfaces are identified by both a VLAN and a port or in a second mode in which interfaces are identified only by a VLAN.* The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Vargese teaches two methods of operation, one in which both the VLAN and port are identified through association (See column 8, lines 15-19) and one in which the source addresses for each VLAN is utilized (See column 7, lines 35-36.) Therefore, Vargese teaches *wherein the layer-3 multicast routing table may operate in a first mode in which interfaces are identified by both a VLAN and a port or in a second mode in which interfaces are identified only by a VLAN.*

On page 13 of the brief, regarding claims 45-47, the Applicant argues Gleeson does not teach *forwarding the packet with the changed MAC address but with the same TTL value.* The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Gleeson teaches the switch may, but doesn't have to, utilize traditional routing functions, such as, decrementing the TTL value (See column 13, lines 52-62.) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time was made to implement packet forwarding with same TTL value in the system of Gleeson. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to implement a router with a greater effective

Art Unit: 2616

hop count limit to increase the effective propagation range of a datagram for communication with distant devices as consistent with traditional routing functions, as taught by Gleeson.

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Donald L. Mills whose telephone number is 571-272-3094. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Seema Rao can be reached on 571-272-3174. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Donald L Mills

DLM

March 2, 2007

Seema S. Rao
SEEMA S. RAO 315107
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER